



Ayako Sato/DC/USEPA/US
04/30/2007 02:34 PM

To Cheryl Clark/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
cc Phillip Schindel/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
bcc
Subject 833469 LEJCOC **Addendum to Competition Rationale**

The proposed award amount is consistent with the award amounts stated in the announcement. We said we would make 10 awards for \$100,000 each in the RFA and that's what we did.

Ayako Sato
OECA/Office of Environmental Justice
US Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW (2201A)
Washington, DC 20460
P (202) 564-5396
F (202) 501-0740

----- Forwarded by Ayako Sato/DC/USEPA/US on 04/30/2007 03:32 PM -----

EJ Collaborative Problem-Solving Cooperative Agreement Program
07CPS-R6-004 - Louisiana Environmental Justice Community Organization Coalition

SUMMARY OF STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES	
I.	<p><u>Past Performance in Reporting Outputs and Outcomes</u></p> <p>Although the applicant lists other organizations within its network that has experience reporting on outputs and outcomes, the applicant itself does not. The reviewers are required to give a neutral score of two.</p>
II.	<p><u>Community and Environmental and/or Public Health Information</u></p> <p>a. Group One - (1) - (2) The local identified issue is "air toxics" throughout the various communities along the Louisiana coast, and the applicant's goal is to improve the state of air quality in Louisiana.</p> <p>b. Group Two - (3) - (5) The applicant does a good job providing demographic information. The reviewers would have liked to have seen more specifics on the breakdown based on the community.</p>
III.	<p><u>Organization's Historical Connection to Affected Community</u></p> <p>(1) The applicant provides specific instances (with stories and anecdotes) where they provided assistance to the affected community.</p> <p>(2) The applicant has clearly worked with the community on other environmental issues and provides specific examples.</p> <p>(3) This section was not directly addressed in the write-up. However, it can be inferred that the residents have been involved in the decision-making process by virtue of the fact that the organization is composed of the various leaders of each of the 14 communities.</p> <p>(4) The write-up did not specifically address this section, but it can be inferred that the applicant has increased capacity through the work that they have done with the residents.</p> <p>(5) The applicant did not directly address how they will continue to work with the communities, but it can be inferred that they will maintain relationships with the various communities.</p>
IV.	<p><u>Organizational Capacity and Programmatic Capacity</u></p> <p>Although relatively new as a stand alone organization, they provide sufficient detail in how they will manage the project and the</p>

administrative, financial and programmatic aspects.

V. Project Description

a. Group One - (1) - (3)

The applicant adequately addresses this section, but it was not their strongest section. The reviewers would have liked to have seen more implementation in terms of addressing the issue in the earlier portion of the project period. The first two years of the project involve identifying the issue and training, and the third year will be dedicated to implementation. The applicant does a good job describing the roles of the various partners.

b. Group Two - (4) - (5)

This section was the applicant's strongest area. The applicant fully embraces alternative dispute resolution, and in fact, ADR is the central focus of this project. The applicant could have elaborated further on Constructive Engagement with Other Stakeholders.

c. Group Three - (4) - (5)

The reviewers were looking for a more detailed description of how the partnership structure will be managed, particularly because this project involves various communities. The applicant did a very good job in describing how they will use evaluation as a tool to improve and make adjustments to their project.

VI. Qualifications of the Principal Investigator/Project Manager

The applicant does a very good job describing the PM's qualifications.

VII. Activity Timeline

The activity timeline was adequate, but the activities are mostly about meetings, training, and forums. The activity timeline should include activities for actively addressing the issue.

VIII. Detailed Budget

The applicant does a fair job of the detailed budget. Some costs are questionable such as the cell phones.

IX. Project Performance Measures

(1) The applicant makes a very good attempt at baseline.

(2) The applicant makes a good attempt at performance measures, but they remain vague and questionable about attainability.